

**REMARKS**

The rejections of Claims 67-70, 78 and 82 as being anticipated by Burson and of Claims 68-91, 99 and 100 as being unpatentable over Scofield in view of Burson are deemed moot in view of the cancellation of those claims.

The rejection of Claims 92-98 as being unpatentable over Scofield in view of Burson and Yamada et al under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is, however, respectfully traversed. Reconsideration is requested in view of the following remarks.

Accepting, for argument's sake, that it would have been obvious to modify the Scofield alternator by employing the ferromagnetic support ring 20 employed in the Burson alternator, it would not have been obvious to employ in that hypothetical alternator structure the claimed cooling fan/cowling arrangement without a massive redesign, if not total deconstruction, of the Scofield alternator.

Figs. 3 and 11 of the Yamada et al publication only show a generator 22 having a crankcase cover 74 with vents or holes 88 for an intake to cool the generator. The three prior art documents do not employ an inner flywheel portion that has a cooling fan or blower. The Burson patent says nothing whatsoever about a cooling fan or blower, whereas the Scofield patent uses the entire flywheel to house an interior space 19 for supplying air at the periphery intended, via the airtight cover 42, for being emptied onto a finned muffler. To the extent that the cover 42 can arguably be considered a cowling, it is located on the high pressure side of the fan as is the case with the Yamada et al generator

in which the cooling fan 60 is also downstream of the so-called cowling (engine crankcase cover 24).

Even assuming that Scofield, Burson and Yamada et al would have been combinable without exercising hindsight reconstruction, the resulting combination would not have resulted in the claimed invention herein. Indeed, although the Office Action suggests that one skilled in the art would have found it obvious to use adjacent ferromagnetic material, such suggestion would also work contrary to Scofield's express teaching to construct the entire flywheel 11 and frame 20 of aluminum and employ only the bar magnets, preferably made of chrome to provide high field densities, to generate the current and provide the flywheel effect. Absent impermissible hindsight, one of ordinary skill would not have even looked to Burson for modifying the Scofield apparatus.

Accordingly, early and favorable action is now earnestly solicited.

If there are any questions regarding this response or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and

please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit  
Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #029211.52672US).

July 19, 2010

Respectfully submitted,



---

James F. McKeown  
Registration No. 25,406

CROWELL & MORING LLP  
Intellectual Property Group  
P.O. Box 14300  
Washington, DC 20044-4300  
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500  
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844  
JFM/cee